



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/599,882

10/12/2006

Eric Thelen

DE040094

6781

24737

7590

09/30/2008

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS

P.O. BOX 3001

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

CHEN, CAI Y

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

4126

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/30/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/599,882	<b>Applicant(s)</b> THELEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> CAI CHEN	<b>Art Unit</b> 4126	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 October 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 October 2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/10/2007</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Drawings***

1. The drawings are objected to because Figure 1 to Figure 2 because numeral labels need to indicate by text as described in the specification.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 4126

((b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-9, and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kwoh (6,115,057).

Regarding claim 1, Kwoh discloses a method for controlling a media content processing device, comprising:

Pre-defining a plurality of content descriptors (The rating level such as G, PG-13, and R rating are used to defined the video content segment, see Fig. 24, and 27, Abstract, col. 1, line 62-col. 2, line 25, col. 15, line 53-col. 16, line 62) ;

Determining whether a media content to be processed is described by a pre-defined content descriptor (Fig. 31a-31b, Abstract, col. 1, line 62-col. 2, col. 15, line 53-col. 16, line 62, col. 18, lines 46-67, col. 19, lines 1-35);

Automatically adjusting a device control parameter based on the content descriptor which describes the media content to be processed (The bad languages and violent scent of the videos are blocked off by the parental control function based on rating level of the video content, Fig. 31a-31d, col. 10, lines 21-26, col. 16, lines 7-67, col. 18, lines 53-67, col. 19, line 10-35); and

Automatically controlling the media content processing device, based on the device control parameter (The bad languages and violent scent of the videos are blocked off by the parental control function based on rating level of the video content

defined by the parental user, Fig. 31a-32d, abstract, col. 10, lines 21-26, col. 16, lines 7-67, col. 18, lines 53-67, col. 19, line 10-35).

Regarding claim 2, Kwoh further discloses wherein the content descriptor is entered by a user (Abstract, col. 1, line 62-col. 2, line 25, col. 16, lines 60-62).

Regarding claim 3, Kwoh further discloses wherein the media content comprise, as an accompany signal, the content descriptor describing the media content to be processed (col. 3, lines 5-9, Fig. 24, and 27, Abstract, col. 1, line 62-col. 2, line 25, col. 15, line 53-col. 16, line 62 ).

Regarding claim 4, Kwoh further discloses wherein the content descriptor is extracted from the media content to be processed (The rating of the video content is exacted from the video and compare to the desire rate set by parental control, see Fig. 24, and 27, Abstract, col. 1, line 62-col. 2, line 25, col. 15, line 53-col. 16, line 62, col. 18, line 54-col. 19, line 35).

Regarding claim 5, Kwoh further discloses wherein the content descriptor processing device (el. 11, Fig. 1) comprises a content rendering device (el. 45, Fig. 1), and the device control parameter controls the content rendering (el. 40, Fig. 1, the bad languages and violent scent of the videos are blocked off by the parental control function based on rating level of the video content defined by the parental user, Fig.

Art Unit: 4126

31a-31d, abstract, col. 10, lines 21-26, col. 16, lines 7-67, col. 18, lines 53-67, col. 19, line 10-35).

Regarding claim 6, Kwoh further discloses wherein the device control parameter controls the volume of the content rendering device (The audio content of non desire video is being blocked off by the parental control, see Fig. 31a-32d, abstract, col. 10, lines 21-26, col. 16, lines 7-67, col. 17, line 65-67, col. 18, lines 53-67, col. 19, line 10-35).

Regarding claim 7, Kwoh further discloses wherein the device control parameter configures a functional unit of the media content processing device to control the reaction of this function unit in response to specific input parameters (The rating level defined in parental control function controls the parental control circuitry to block off the undesired content and displays the text data or commands the audio synthesizer to voice the text data, Fig. 1, Fig. 31a-32d, abstract, col. 10, lines 21-26, col. 16, lines 7-67, col. 17, line 65-67, col. 18, lines 53-67, col. 19, line 10-35 ).

Regarding claim 8, Kwoh further discloses wherein the function unit comprises a user interface, and the device control parameter controls the interaction between user and the media content processing unit (The user has to enter in the ID code to access the setting of parental control setting, see Fig. 1, Fig. 9, Fig. 10, col. 7, line 20-col. 8, line 41).

Regarding claim 9, Kwoh further discloses wherein the device control parameter controls the response of the media content processing device to remote control commands (The user uses the remote controller to enter in the ID code in order to access the setting of parental control setting, see Fig. 1, Fig. 9, Fig. 10, Fig. 18, col. 7, line 20-col. 8, line 41).

Regarding claim 11, Kwoh further discloses wherein the relationship between device control parameter and content descriptor can be configured by the user (The rating level such as G, PG-13, and R rating are used to defined the video content segment and those ratings are configured in the parental control function to censor the undesired content, see Fig. 24, and 27, Abstract, col. 1, line 62-col. 2, line 25, col. 10, lines 20-31, col. 15, line 53-col. 16, line 62).

Regarding claim 12, Kwoh further discloses wherein a media content processing device (Fig. 1, el. 11), comprising:

A content descriptor detection arrangement configured for determining whether a media content to be processed is described by a predefined content descriptor of a plurality of predefined content descriptors (The rating levels such as G, PG-13, and R rating are used to defined the video content segment, see Fig. 24, and 27, Abstract, col. 1, line 62-col. 2, line 25, col. 15, line 53-col. 16, line 62;

A control unit (el. 40, Fig. 1) configured such that a device control parameter describing the media content to be processed (The rating level defined in the parental control function controls the parental control circuitry to block off the undesired content, Fig. 1, Fig. 31a-32d, abstract, col. 10, lines 21-26, col. 16, lines 7-67, col. 17, line 65-67, col. 18, lines 53-67, col. 19, line 10-35 ),

And the media content processing device is automatically controlled based on the device control parameter (The video media content to display is automatically censored by the parental control function according to the rating level of the video content, see Fig. 1, Fig. 31a-32d, abstract, col. 10, lines 21-26, col. 16, lines 7-67, col. 17, line 65-67, col. 18, lines 53-67, col. 19, line 10-35).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwoh in view of Cragun (5,973,683)

Regarding claim 10, Kwoh discloses every limitation of claim 10.

Kwoh does not explicitly disclose the function unit comprises at least one of a speech recognition device and a speaker identification device.



Cragun teaches the function unit comprises at least one of a speech recognition device and a speaker identification device (There is a speech recognition device in order to censor any offensive word under the parental control environment, see Fig. 3, col. 11, lines 55-67)

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to modify Kwoh teaching to include the function unit comprises at least one of a speech recognition device and a speaker identification device, as taught by Cragun, in order to regulate the media environment on the television for child viewers (abstract).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CAI CHEN whose telephone number is (571)270-5679. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8 to 5 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Scott Beliveau can be reached on 571-272-7343. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 4126

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

C. C.  
Examiner, Art Unit 4126

/Scott Beliveau/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2623